

REMARKS

Claims 1-10 have been cancelled and claims 11-21 are pending in the present application after amendment herein. Claims 11-21 stand rejected under 35 USC 102(b) as being anticipated by US patent No. 4,903,192 9 (hereinafter Saito). The Office Communication objects to the claims in view of a misnumbering of the claims, and the Examiner has correctly renumbered the claims. The Applicant appreciates the Examiner's correction of this error and the claim numbering listed herein reflects the correction made by the Examiner via the Office Communication. Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of the rejections and objections in view of the foregoing amendments and the following remarks.

The claim number has been corrected by the Examiner; therefore the objection to the claims has been overcome.

Claim 11 is directed to a method for controlling a component of a technical plant by a proportional-plus-integral (PI) controller that has control parameters including a control ratio indicative of a proportional gain and an integral-action time. As amended, claim 11 in part recites reducing the value of the control ratio if the time response of the actual value has a dwell time during which the actual value of the controlled variable varies within the tolerance band. The dwell time is smaller than a first defined time period during operation of the technical plant. A duration of the dwell time relative to a duration of the first defined time period is selected to determine a sufficiently fast rate of change of the controlled variable relative to a time constant of the component. The reduction of the value of the control ratio is configured to reduce the rate of change of the controlled variable. Basis for the foregoing amendment may be found at least in paragraphs 49 and 50 of the US patent application publication of the present invention.

MPEP §2131 provides that a claim is anticipated only if each and every element as set forth in the claim is found, either expressly or inherently described in a single prior art reference. The identical invention must be shown in as complete detail as contained in the claim. The elements must be arranged as required by the claim.

Saito fails to teach or suggest any selection of a dwell time relative to a first defined time period to determine a fast rate of change of the controlled variable relative to a time constant of the component. Saito further fails to teach or suggest a reduction of the value of a control ratio

indicative of a proportional gain to reduce the rate of change of the controlled variable.

Anticipation under 35 U.S.C. §102 requires that “The identical invention must be shown in as complete detail as contained in the ...claim.” (Citations omitted) Accordingly, it is submitted that Saito fails to anticipate or otherwise render unpatentable claim 11.

Claims 12-15 depend from claim 11 and thus incorporate the structural and/or operational relationships set forth in claim 11 plus their own respective recitations. It is respectfully submitted that Saito also fails to anticipate such claims under the §102 statutory requirements and these rejections should be similarly withdrawn.

Claim 16 is directed to a proportional-plus-integral (PI) controller for controlling a component of a technical plant. As amended, claim 11 in part recites an adaptation device for reducing the value of the control ratio if the time response of the actual value has a dwell time during which the actual value of the controlled variable varies within the tolerance band. The dwell time is smaller than a first defined time period. A duration of the dwell time relative to a duration of the first defined time period is selected to determine a sufficiently fast rate of change of the controlled variable relative to a time constant of the component. The reduction of the value of the control ratio by the adaptation device is configured to reduce the rate of change of the controlled variable.

Saito fails to teach or suggest any adaptation device for reducing the value of the control ratio if the time response of the control variable has a dwell time during which the actual value of the control variable varies through the tolerance band. Saito further fails to teach or suggest any selection of a dwell time relative to a first defined time period to determine a fast rate of change of the controlled variable relative to a time constant of the component. Anticipation under 35 U.S.C. §102 requires that “The identical invention must be shown in as complete detail as contained in the ...claim.” (Citations omitted) Accordingly, it is submitted that Saito fails to anticipate or otherwise render unpatentable claim 16.

Claims 17-20 depend from claim 16 and thus incorporate the structural and/or operational relationships set forth in claim 16 plus their own respective recitations. It is respectfully submitted that Saito also fails to anticipate such claims under the §102 statutory requirements and these rejections should be similarly withdrawn.

Independent claim 19 recites the operational relationship of "reducing the control ratio if a change rate of the actual value is greater than a change rate of the set value." Saito fails to teach or suggest such an operational relationship. Accordingly, it is submitted that Saito fails to anticipate or otherwise render unpatentable claim 21.

Conclusion

It is respectfully submitted that each of the claims pending in this application recite patentable subject matter, and it is further submitted that such claims comply with all statutory requirements and thus each of such claims should be allowed.

The commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any appropriate fees due in connection with this paper, including the fees specified in 37 C.F.R. §§ 1.16 (c), 1.17(a)(1) and 1.20(d), or credit any overpayments to Deposit Account No. 19-2179.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: 12-19-2007

By: Janet D. Hood

Janet D. Hood
Registration No. 61,142
(407) 736-6449

Siemens Corporation
Intellectual Property Department
170 Wood Avenue South
Iselin, New Jersey 08830